

## Remarks

By this amendment, Applicants have amended claim 4 and the abstract. As a result, claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the remarks below. These amendments are being made to facilitate early allowance of the presently claimed subject matter. Applicants do not acquiesce in the correctness of the objections and rejections and reserve the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the original claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

Initially, Applicants thank the Examiner for his time and courtesy in conducting a telephone interview with Applicants' representative (John A. Merecki) on June 18, 2009. During the interview, the claims being examined were discussed. Applicants' Preliminary Amendment filed on June 5, 2006 added two new claims and they were not considered in the first Office Action. The Examiner agreed to reset the time period to respond and send a Supplemental Office Action. Claims 1-8 are pending.

In the Office Action, the abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the phrase "such a" on line 2 is allegedly misspelled. Also, the Office asserts that the term "Fig. 1" following the abstract should be removed. Applicants have amended the abstract and respectfully request that the Office withdraw this objection.

Claims 4-6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. The Office asserts that claim 4 allegedly does

not recite any physical hardware element and that the “checker” as recited by the claim can be construed as consisting entirely of software. Applicants have amended claim 4 to include “over the data transmission network.” Applicants assert that one having ordinary skill in the art would know that a data transmission network includes hardware components. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the rejection.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Butterworth et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0133656 A1), hereinafter “Butterworth” and in view of Lewontin (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0071419 A1), hereinafter “Lewontin.” Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection on the following grounds.

Applicants assert that the Office’s rejection is defective, as the Office fails to assert which portions of either Butterworth or Lewontin allegedly teach or suggest certain limitations of the independent claims. For example, the Office fails to assert how Butterworth in view of Lewontin teach or suggest “responding to the client from a web service point associated with said old address.” See claim 1. The Office also fails to assert how Butterworth in view of Lewontin teach or suggest “wherein the header *us[es] said message exchange protocol*.” See claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Additionally, Applicants disagree with the Office’s assertions in the Office Action. The Office points to paragraph [0044] of Lewontin as allegedly teaching or suggesting “wherein the header ... contains a redirection to a new address.” See Office Action, page 4. However, Applicants assert that paragraph [0044] of Lewontin discloses a protocol header as an HTTP header. Applicants contend

that an HTTP is a transfer protocol, not a message exchange protocol. In contrast, claim 1 provides a “header using said message exchange protocol.”

Further, the Office simply rejects claim 4 as a system claim that corresponds to the method of claim 1. See Office Action, page 5. However, Applicants assert that claim 4 includes features that are not disclosed by claim 1. For example, claim 4 includes “a checker in a SOAP runtime” of a service provider and of a client.

If the Office chooses to maintain this rejection, Applicants respectfully request that the Office further clarify how the references teach or suggest each and every feature of each claim. For example, Applicants respectfully request that the Office clarify how Butterworth in view of Lewontin allegedly teach “the header using said message exchange protocol” or “a checker in a SOAP runtime of said service provider” or “a checker in said SOAP runtime of the client.” See claim 4.

In light of the above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections of claim 1-8, as allegedly being unpatentable over Butterworth in view of Lewontin.

Applicants submit that each of the pending claims is patentable for one or more additional unique features. To this extent, Applicants do not acquiesce to the Examiner’s interpretation of the claimed subject matter or the references used in rejecting the claimed subject matter. These features have not been separately addressed herein for brevity. However, Applicants reserve the right to present such arguments in a later response should one be necessary.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/ Elaine Chi /

Elaine Chi  
Reg. No. 61,194

Dated: November 5, 2009

Hoffman Warnick LLC  
75 State Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile